



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE UNIFICATION OF COLLEGE DEGREES

By PROFESSOR W. S. SUTTON,
University of Texas

At the last meeting of this association a speaker declared that "for a long time the B.A. degree has stood for all that is best in culture and education." At this same meeting President Charles W. Dabney, of the University of Tennessee, recommended that "all academic degrees except the B.A. and, possibly the B.S., be abolished." He has not the shadow of a doubt that the B.A. degree represents liberal culture, but his qualification of "possibly" with respect to the B.S. degree may be taken as evidence that he does not consider the two degrees as occupying the same plane. In an address, delivered by President Eliot, of Harvard, before the members of Johns Hopkins University in February 1884, the B.A. degree was said to be "the customary evidence of a liberal education." Dr. Hinsdale, of the University of Michigan, referring to this matter some years ago, thus stated a well-known fact: "But it is England and her educational dependencies that have given this degree its highest standing in the world of letters. In these countries it has long been the badge of an educated man." President Schurman, in a paper written in March 1897, to explain Cornell's action in coming to the one degree basis, said that the B.A. degree has long stood for the fullest measure of liberal education. But it is needless to multiply witnesses; in England and America it is the general belief that the B.A. degree, above any other degree, signifies that its holder has pursued courses of study, completion of which ensures a liberal education.

Nor is it at all surprising that this degree has been chosen as the standard of culture, for, while with respect to many things there is nothing in a name, historic facts are frequently crystallized in names, as a short statement of the rise of university degrees will attest. The first degrees granted by mediæval universities were *Master* and *Doctor*. They were first granted at Salernum, Bologna, and Paris, to persons who had demonstrated their fitness to teach or to practice law, medicine, or theology. These two titles, which were used interchangeably, in the beginning had no connection whatever with the "arts" studies, university work, as intimated above, being confined to professional instruction. Later on, because of the fact that universities were either the outgrowth of the "arts" schools, or were developed in association with them, the "arts" faculty was added to the professional faculties of law, medicine, and theology, and hence arose the

practice of conferring the mastership or doctorate for proficiency in the "arts" subjects also. It is altogether probable that the early doctorate or mastership was not a formal degree, but merely a license, or a faculty to teach (*licentia docendi, facultas docendi*). It may not be improper to remark here, by way of parenthesis, that the old universities considered it their chief duty to give men preparation for teaching and that modern universities are resuming a function which, for causes not necessary to recount, was allowed to lapse, but which thoughtful men everywhere are beginning to realize is a factor of no mean importance in the progress of education.

In the course of time the mastership was confined to "arts" graduates in the University of Paris, an example which had great influence on other universities, while the doctorate was reserved for those who completed their studies in one of the professional faculties, law, medicine, or theology. In Germany, however, the two titles were not distinguished, but in the end *Master* was eliminated and *Doctor* came to be applied to "arts," as well as to professional studies. Even the term "arts" has disappeared and *philosophy*, the chief of the "arts" studies, has been adopted instead.

A brief inquiry concerning the Latin term, *artes*, may be of advantage in tracing the history of "arts" degrees. The word *studies* is, without doubt, the best English equivalent for the Latin, *artes*. The ancient Greeks and Romans did not make the clear distinction between the arts and the sciences that exists in modern thought. The seven liberal arts, which formed the curriculum of secondary education in the Middle Ages, embraced (1) the trivium, consisting of grammar (Latin grammar, to be sure,) dialectics, or logic, and rhetoric; and (2) the quadrivium, composed of arithmetic, geometry, music, and astronomy. These seven studies were not intended to give training for professional or industrial life but were designed to afford that mental development which free men should enjoy. These "arts" having been incorporated into the work of the universities, the University of Paris led the way in establishing the practice of granting the degree of Bachelor of Arts upon boys who, by completing the trivium, had reached the half-way point in the "arts" course. It is believed that the practice of European guilds had decided influence upon the question of university degrees, for the universities were themselves, in reality, only guilds of learning. As mastership in a guild was preceded by a period of apprenticeship, so mastership in "arts" followed a term of bachelorship. While prosecuting the studies of the quadrivium, it was

also the duty of the student, who had completed the trivium and had received his B.A. degree, to assist the masters in instructing the freshmen, the new aspirants for what might be called the *apprentice* degree in learning. Upon receiving his B.A. degree the youth was said to enter upon arts (*incipere in artibus*). The degree, consequently, looked forward to the time when the "arts" studies would be completed and when the bachelor would enter upon his career of mastership.

According to Professor Laurie, of the University of Edinburgh, the title first used to indicate completion of the trivium was *baccalarius*, meaning a cowherd in the service of a farmer, *bacca* being low Latin for cow (*vacca*.) Afterward an error in etymology, which intimately connected the laurel berry with graduation, transformed *baccalarius* into *baccalaureus*. Whatever may be the derivation of the term bachelor, it is certain that, up to the time of the great Renaissance, the B.A. degree was conferred upon boys about 17 or 18 years of age when they had finished the first three "arts" studies, grammar, dialectics, and rhetoric. Though this course occupied the time of the student for three or four years, it would today be considered as much inferior to the course of the modern secondary school. There was no provision made for the study of Latin or Greek literature, the study of Latin being confined almost entirely to grammar. Latin, it is true, was the language of the scholars and of the church, but it was not taught as one of the "arts." Greek was not given a place among the seven liberal arts. Logic and rhetoric were taught in their elements, but the training they afforded was derived mainly through demands made upon the verbal memory. The mathematics given was of a superficial character, while the astronomy did not rise above the dignity of astrology.

With the Renaissance in the fifteenth century came great changes in the educational world. The rediscovery of the literatures of ancient Greece and Rome and the consequent enthusiasm which it aroused for the humanities and which spread over Europe with incredible rapidity, not only established places for Latin and Greek among the "arts," but also resulted in making the classics almost the only "arts" taught in the schools. The classical curriculum fastened upon European nations by Sturm and Ascham, was given almost world-wide sovereignty by the Jesuits. America, as was natural, followed the example of England, and enthroned the classics. No more powerful influence has appeared in educational history than that of the humanists, with whom scholarship derived through the study of the ancient classics became the ideal, *the summum bonum*, and in fact the *solum bonum*,

of education. It is this ideal that has determined the significance of the B.A. degree for hundreds of years. A bachelor of arts, up till very recent times, has been little more than a bachelor of the classics. The requirements for this degree were fixed before many studies with which we are acquainted were born. The modern languages and literatures, including English, the natural sciences, and historical and sociological studies were, for the most part, if not altogether, either unknown or confined to the contributions of the old Greeks and Romans. To this day it is said that, "if there is any branch of learning in no way connected with Aristotle and Plato, which is lectured on at Oxford, it is an oversight," so tremendous has been the power of tradition. The B.A. graduate of Harvard in the early days had spent four years engaged chiefly in classical study, and had complied with the following conditions for graduation, which are quoted from the records of that institution: "Every scholar that on proof is found able to read the originals of the Old and New Testament [and translate] into the Latin tongue, and to resolve them logically, withal being of godly life and conversation, and at any public act hath the approbation of the overseers and the master of the college, is fitted to be dignified with his first degree." Of course the preparation demanded for entrance into college was along classical lines. Henry Dunster, Harvard's first president, formulated admission requirements as follows: "Whoever shall be able to read Cicero or any other such like classical author at sight (it is refreshing to see this sensible provision for election), and make and speak true Latin in verse and prose, *suo ut aiunt Marte*, and decline perfectly the paradigms of nouns and verbs in the Greek tongue: Let him then and not before be capable of admission into college." As late as 1856 the required study of Greek and Latin occupied at least two fifths of the Harvard student's time. A great majority of American colleges and universities at the present time require candidates for the B.A. degree to be trained in Latin and Greek both before and after entering upon college or university studies. In the Report of the United States Commissioner of Education for 1896-7 there is given a tabulated statement of the B.A. degree entrance requirements of four hundred thirty-two colleges and universities. Latin is required by four hundred two of these institutions, both Latin and Greek by three hundred eighteen, a modern language by sixty. A modern language is made optional with Greek in twenty-five, while, in addition to Latin and Greek, it is required by forty-three. Surely no further proof is necessary to show how strong is

the hold the classics have upon the traditional degree of a liberal education.

It is worthy of note, however, that the classical requirements have lost much of their rigor. In their golden age they represented almost the entire curriculum. Before election of studies was known, the four-year curriculum exacted of the student study of Latin and Greek throughout his college career. Examination of the B.A. degree requirements now in vogue in this country reveals the fact that emphasis is laid upon the classics before, rather than after, the student's entrance into college. It is safe to assert that none of our leading institutions require the four-year study of either Latin or Greek in college, the great majority being satisfied if, for one year, or at most two years, the student shall experience the joys and sorrows incident to classical instruction. Even in Oxford University the requirements have been marvelously changed, indeed revolutionized, for in that oldest of English universities, there are now as many as seven avenues to the B.A. degree, which is conferred upon men completing satisfactorily the work of any one of these schools: *literæ humaniores*, mathematics, modern history, theology, jurisprudence, natural science, and Oriental studies. Within any one of these schools there is also an almost indefinite number of options. There are, of course, what may be termed entrance requirements with respect to the classics, but they are by no means severe, the Greek texts of Mark and John, four books of the *Anabasis* and four books of Cæsar being considered sufficient. In Harvard the B.A. degree can be granted to one even though, during his collegiate course, he may not have studied the classics a single hour. Harvard, nevertheless, still retains a classical requirement for entrance. These facts just now presented justified the conclusion that the colleges have, to a large extent, broken with their traditions, and have, to some degree at least, adjusted their curricula to meet the demands of a new social order; but they also prove that while the influence of the classics has waned, it is yet powerful in the regulation of graduation requirements. There are fewer than a half dozen reputable American institutions in which the classics, in some form or another, are not absolutely prescribed in all, or nearly all, the courses leading to purely academic degrees.

Being germane to this discussion, the inquiry is now raised, why has our typical college course, which was inherited from Oxford and Cambridge, and which was built upon the traditional *tripos* of Greek, Latin, and mathematics, been subjected to so great changes? In the

first place, as successful men in the various professions began to achieve renown in the world of culture also, even though they had not received the traditional scholastic training, it began to dawn upon the minds of the people that subjects other than those found in college courses are valuable as means for mental discipline and for securing that indefinable result known as culture.

Again, men looked about them and observed that tremendous changes, and changes conducive to progress, had been effected in all departments of human endeavor with the exception of the most important of all, that of education. Herbert Spencer represented the opinion of a large class of men when he declared in an essay published in the *Westminster Review* in 1859, "If we inquire what is the real motive for giving boys a classical education, we find it to be simply conformity to public opinion. Men dress their children's minds as their bodies, in the prevailing fashions." Spencer was far from being a utilitarian of the baser kind in education, yet he condemned that practice which, if it did not proscribe absolutely, assigned a very insignificant place to those knowledges that are more or less positively related to the arts of life. His school of educational thinkers criticised the point of view of the old curriculum, saying that it looked almost entirely, if not altogether, to the very ancient past for its ideas; that it emphasized the history of ancient, to the exclusion of modern, nations; that, without realizing the power of the modern classics, it glorified the ancient languages and literatures; and that it almost totally disregarded the natural sciences, that field of modern learning by whose cultivation the world's civilization has been born anew. Not only in the mother country, but also in America, where the practical spirit is stronger, the clamor for the new studies and the demand for their introduction into the curriculum became so strong that one by one they were grudgingly admitted. In many American institutions they were considered as extras or "side-fixings," and for years they bore the brunt of flippant jest and cruel sneer. Nevertheless, the recognition, however slight, of a new study compelled the shortening of the time that had been given to the traditional studies, for it was idle to demand that the four-year course be increased one year or more. As the new studies fought their way into the colleges, the B.A. degree, which had all along maintained its majesty in the world of the liberal arts, gradually came to represent less of classical culture. In fact there is ground for belief that the degree granted by colleges having a fixed four-year *potpourri* curriculum does not represent culture

of any kind. The compulsion of the student to devote himself in rapid succession to Latin, Greek, mathematics, physiology, botany, zoölogy, history, philosophy, French, German, political economy, etc., prevented him from undue specializing, it is true; but it also stretched out his breadth of culture to so great a degree as to reduce its depth at any point to little, if any, above zero. The great majority of these *potpourri* curricula were arranged without any regard to controlling doctrines of education. Expediency, willingness to effect compromises even at the cost of truth, the strength and aggressiveness of professors and regents were some of the factors determining whether a study should gain prominence or sink into insignificance. These curricula are rapidly becoming obsolete, for they are foolish, preposterous and disastrous, and they perpetrate such outrages upon the most elementary educational principles as cannot be tolerated in an age which, above all preceding ages, is demanding sanity as well as zeal in pedagogical performances. Fourteen weeks in the study of a science may result in the memorizing of a few definitions and made-to-order classifications; hitting the ground only in high places in traversing any great field of human learning may cultivate a certain kind of mental agility; but such practices cannot beget any real discipline.

To the leaders in natural science belongs much of the credit for the improvement of courses of study. Encouraged by the Morrill Act, which was passed by Congress in 1862 and of which nearly every state in the Union has since taken advantage, teachers of natural science demanded that it be taught intelligently. None knew better than they that a smattering of science, gained without experience in the laboratory, is without profit, is a delusion amounting almost to a crime, and that such a science is utterly unworthy to rank with Greek, Latin, and mathematics as a liberal art. They recognized that, far from being a liberal art, it was a liberal humbug of colossal proportions. As late as 1872 Professor Jordan, now President Jordan, of Leland Stanford Junior University, complained of the condition of science teaching. He was at that time professor of natural history in an Illinois college; it was his duty to give instruction in zoölogy, botany, geology, physiology, physics, chemistry, mineralogy, natural theology, and political economy. No wonder he confesses with Spartan brevity that he taught "a little of each to little purpose." At one time he attempted to establish a small chemical laboratory, but the board of trustees informed him that students should be kept out of what was called the "cabinet" in order that the apparatus might not be hurt and the chemicals

wasted. But Professor Jordan and his colleagues persisted in their determination to dignify work in science. Among the great leaders may be mentioned Agassiz, who may be regarded as the father of the B.S. degree, and whose labors in Harvard marked an era in the history of that institution. So thoroughly has the educational value of science been demonstrated that in all reputable colleges it is no longer questioned.

Similarly the modern languages (including English), history and the sociological group of studies were raised to the plane of the liberal arts. The new studies having gained actual, not nominal, recognition, college faculties were compelled to decide that no student could be expected, within the short period of his academic life, to give attention to all the subjects in which instruction was offered. For this reason the third phase of the B.A. curriculum appeared, the phase through which it is now passing, and which has for its characteristic feature the elective system of studies. This system, which prevails to a greater or a less degree in the colleges of the country, recognizes the inherent value of all studies, new as well as old; but even yet, so far as the B.A. degree is concerned, it is generally held that Latin, at least, is indispensable, for which in the now almost unlimited range of the liberal arts there is no adequate substitute. The system of election, however, has greatly modified the requirements for this degree, which is now conferred upon men and women that have pursued widely varying courses of study.

The several courses leading to the B.A. degree as now conferred by Tulane University represent fairly well the evolution of that degree, the principle of election, however, being somewhat limited, as it is confined to four-year curricula instead of smaller groups of subjects or to individual subjects. Tulane has three B.A. curricula. The first is denominated "The Classical Course," in which Greek and Latin are required in each of the four years, and mathematics in the freshman and sophomore years. That the Tulane authorities believe the classical to be the best of the three B.A. courses, this paragraph, taken from the catalogue of 1898-9, leaves little room to doubt: "The Classical Course, following well-approved lines, requires both Greek and Latin, thus affording to the student willing to submit to the invaluable and unsurpassed mental discipline of these studies the opportunity to obtain a solid classical education." The "Literary Course" is the "Classical Course" so changed as to permit the substitution of modern languages for Greek. The great majority of the

college world would commend Tulane for recognizing the equivalence of Greek and modern languages, and for conferring the "arts" degree upon graduates of her literary course. Too often the B. Lit. or the Ph.B. degree has been adopted to gratify those not able or willing to meet Greek requirements, thus giving also at the same time no offense to the defenders of the old faith who maintain that any change whatever with respect to the traditional requirements of the classics for the "arts" degree would be fraught with danger to the student, and with ruin to the cause of genuine culture. "The Latin-Scientific Course," the name given to the third of Tulane's B.A. curricula, requires no Greek, and only one year of Latin. The freshman studies are the same as those prescribed in "The Literary Course," while the remaining three years' work is identical with that prescribed for aspirants for the B.S. degree, consisting largely of the natural sciences, together with mathematics and modern languages. It is easy to understand why the term *scientific* is applied to this course, but why the prefix *Latin* occurs is inexplicable to one not acquainted with the history of the arts degree. This third B.A. curriculum was established to meet demands made upon the university authorities, for the Tulane catalogue informs us that "it has been added to meet the suggestion of many, as specially adapted to preparation for the Medical Department." Other students than those having in view the profession of medicine are allowed to pursue the "Latin-Scientific Course." This third B.A. curriculum offered in Tulane fairly represents the present degree of advancement toward the coördination of college studies. Most men are now willing that the "arts" baccalaureate be conferred upon a graduate if only Latin be one of the studies by means of which he has acquired liberal culture.

There can be but one other phase in the evolution of the B.A. degree. Even now there are indications that this fourth phase is at hand. Harvard no longer requires Greek and Latin as collegiate studies, her classical requirement not extending beyond the Latin of the secondary school. The eminent Greek scholar, Professor Goodwin, in the Phi Beta Kappa address delivered at Harvard in 1890, stated with evident regret, that a Phi Beta Kappa man could graduate from that institution without having read a word of Greek or Latin during his college career. Concerning the decadence of time-honored ideals, he remarked: "I regret this breaking-up, but we must accept it as a stubborn fact." Times have indeed vastly changed since the Middle Ages, and educational ideals also have changed to meet the new

requirements of the changed civilization. Already some of the leading universities of America have accepted without qualification the doctrine of equivalence of studies, and, with a desire to foster all studies, and to discriminate against none, have made it possible for the B.A. degree to be obtained regardless of training in either of the ancient classics. Some other institutions, as we have seen in the cases of Harvard and Tulane, are not far from the adoption of a similar policy, for their absolute classical requirement is really of little consequence.

There is abundant testimony from another quarter also. During the last ten years there has been much discussion of problems pertaining to both secondary and higher education. Of high school and college professors there have been many conferences, at some of which the question of election of studies has received no little consideration. At these conferences it has been no unusual thing to hear such statements as these, which were made at a meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools held in the city of Chicago, April 1 and 2, 1898: "So far as Latin is concerned, it is a well-known fact that the trend of universities today is in the direction of dispensing with Latin as an absolute admission requirement. A student who is a candidate for the B.A. degree is now permitted to enter Harvard, The University of Pennsylvania, Stanford, Cornell, not to name others, without Latin" (President Rogers, of Northwestern University.) "I was for thirteen years a professor of Latin in Tulane University at New Orleans. I love Latin dearly, but I am against requiring it for all courses anywhere" (President Jesse, of Missouri University). The Committee of Ten, which was appointed in 1895 at the Denver meeting of the National Educational Association to investigate the question of the college-entrance requirements, and which consisted of five college professors and five teachers engaged in secondary schools, made two or three preliminary reports, and then submitted its final report last July as the result of four years' exhaustive study. In the first preliminary report, made in 1896 by Chairman Nightingale, himself a man trained in the classics as a student and for more than twenty years as a teacher, an honored member of many classical conferences, occurs this paragraph, which represents the views of a great number of teachers in the secondary schools: "College courses ought to be so adjusted that every pupil, at the end of a secondary course recognized as excellent both in the quality and quantity of its work, may find the doors of every college swinging wide to receive him into an atmosphere of deeper research and higher

culture along lines of his mental aptitudes. We do not mean that secondary courses should be purely elective, but that this elasticity, based upon psychological laws, should be recognized by the colleges. There is no identity of form, either in mind or matter, in the natural or the spiritual, and since power to adapt one's self to the sphere for which nature designed him, is the end of education, every student should find in the college and university the means by which that power may be secured. If this principle is correct—and who shall prove its fallacy?—why is not the degree of B.S. or Ph.B. of equal dignity and worth with that of A.B.? Or, in other words, why should not all degrees be abolished or molded into one which shall signify that a man or woman has secured that higher education best suited to his talents and the far-reaching purposes of his life?" In the last report of the committee is to be found a series of recommendations in the form of resolutions, the sixth of which advocates four units, *i. e.*, four years of training in foreign language study as a college admission requirement, and as a constant in the course of study of the secondary school. Truly Professor Goodwin made no mistake when he said that we must accept the breaking-up of old ideals as a stubborn fact.

Whether many other American institutions will follow the lead of Cornell and Stanford and adopt the policy of conferring B.A. without regard to the classics, cannot be foretold with certainty. The fourth stage in the evolution of the degree may have a fatal attack of arrested development, but the evidences, only an insignificant portion of which has been given in this paper, are sufficiently strong to create the belief that Latin, as well as Greek, must become reconciled to its "manifest destiny," and must be content with holding a rank no more distinguished than that held by other studies that are, and of right ought to be, classified among the liberal arts.

A brief examination of baccalaureate degrees other than B.A. is not foreign to this discussion, for the new studies have not only made extensive invasions upon the B.A. curriculum, but have also fortified themselves by means of separate, independent curricula leading to new degrees. Historically considered, so far as America is concerned, the first genuine recognition given the new studies was the creation of the new degrees. The old studies had been so long associated with the old degree that the humanists were unwilling then, as many are today, to disturb a union believed to be sacred, while the apostles of the modern subjects were ready, if not eager, to establish a new academic

degree which they hoped would, in the course of time, be considered equal, in fact superior, to the traditional degree. The degree of Bachelor of Science was first conferred in this country in 1851 upon the four members of the graduating class of the Lawrence Scientific School, Joseph Le Conte and David Ames Wells being among the number. The B.S. degree was in the beginning greatly handicapped, both because it was considered inferior and because it was distinctly inferior to B.A. At Harvard the requirements for admission into the Lawrence Scientific School were decidedly less rigorous than the regular entrance requirements of the college. Nearly a half century this inequality was maintained, for in President Eliot's report for 1897-8 we read: "The most important piece of work accomplished by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences for the year under review was the revision of the requirements for admission to Harvard College and the Lawrence Scientific School. . . . The faculty had also agreed upon a preliminary statement of the terms of admission to the Lawrence Scientific School, which involved a gradual raising of the admission requirements for that school to substantial equality with those of the college, although the range of acceptable subjects was larger than in the college." In another paragraph of the same report there is evidence that the elder Agassiz's dream of breaking up the old college routine has been almost, if not altogether, realized. "The status of the scientific student in Cambridge," says Dr. Eliot "has completely changed within ten years; he is no longer an outsider, but a comrade and an equal of the college student in every respect. He has the same rights in the same building and associations; is eligible to the same clubs, teams, and crews; shares with the candidates for the A.B. the delights and charges of Class Day, and graduates on the same day after the same period of residence." The struggle which the B.S. degree encountered at Harvard has marked its history, but frequently with less success, at other institutions. With respect to this matter President Jordan, of Leland Stanford, writes (*The Care and Culture of Men*, p. 175): "Most of our colleges have, at one time or other, arranged courses of study not approved by the faculty in response to the popular demand for many studies in a little time. Such a course of odds and ends is always called 'the scientific course,' and it leads to the appropriate degree of B.S. — Bachelor of Surfaces." In relation to the history of the B.S. degree, President Jordan can fitly use the language of Æneas,

"quaeque ipse miserrima vidi
Et quorum pars magna fui,"

for in the three states he has been a conspicuous figure in educational discussion and progress. He himself tells how he remembers long and dreary faculty meetings, in which were devised scientific courses, short in time and weak in quality, for students voluntarily or necessarily declining to become candidates for the B.A. degree. "There was," he declared in an address delivered in 1893, "no scientific preparation or achievement required in these courses. They were scientific in the sense that they were not anything else. Their degree of Bachelor of Science was regarded, and rightly so, as far inferior to the time-honored B.A. In the inner circle of education, it was regarded as no degree at all. Gradually, however, this despised degree has risen to a place with the others. . . . In our best colleges today the study of science stands side by side with the study of language, and the one counts equally with the other." That the B.S. curriculum did not always train students in science, is not questioned by anyone acquainted with college history. There has been a time when, in one institution, at least, it was possible for a student to obtain the B.S. degree without completing a single year's work in a natural science, with, perhaps, the exception of a one third course in physiology and hygiene. But that time has happily passed away. It is, nevertheless, a fact, admitted by every member of the faculty of that institution, that the requirements for the B.S. degree are even now by no means coördinate with those for the B.A. degree. Illinois University furnishes additional proof that the B.S. degree, in order to acquire respectability, has spent years in the effort to level itself up to the B.A. requirements. President Draper, in a discussion of the elective admission requirements, which were made effective in that institution for the first time in September 1899, maintained that the new plan for entrance rests upon the assumption that the several bachelor degrees are of equivalent value. "The scheme," he explained, "assumes that the degree of Bachelor of Science does, or ought to, imply a discipline, or educational training, equal to that of the Bachelor of Arts; that the man who is trained primarily in scientific work ought to be as liberally trained as a man who has been trained in the humanities. And it was particularly in our effort to make the degrees of the different colleges in our university of equal value that this new scheme was adopted. It raises, I might say in passing, the entrance requirements for courses leading to all degrees, in our university, except that of Bachelor of Arts, from, I think, 20 to 40 per cent." It is, therefore, plain that the University of Illinois, up to the beginning of the present scholastic session, has

not required of her B.S. students as rigorous training as of her B.A. students, and it reasonably follows that, up to this time, her B.A. degree has been justly entitled to preëminence.

Concerning the B.S. degree Cornell University furnishes proof similar to that already set forth in this paper. Up to 1886 a student desiring to enter her B.S. course was examined only in the elementary subjects, to which was added French *or* German covered by *one* year of high-school instruction, *or* advanced mathematics. The requirements ten years later were so changed as to embrace, in addition to the elementary subjects, French *and* German covered by three years' high-school instruction in each of the two languages, *and* advanced mathematics. President Schurman, referring to this matter in 1897, wrote: "Cornell early became convinced that the granting of 'cheap degrees' is in every way hurtful to the interests of true education. . . . The old B.S. and B.L. were unfair rivals of the B.A. . . . The whole trend of legislation at Cornell in the past has been in the direction of equalizing the dignity of degrees by equalizing the difficulty of obtaining them."

In Tulane University the B.S. course has been so strengthened as to bring it up to the B.A. standard, and it is now claimed that the two courses, "though directed in different pursuits in life, are parallel and equivalent in the amount, proportion, and exactness of the training and instruction offered."

On this point additional testimony, which the history of the B.S. degree in many other institutions furnishes, seems unnecessary. Enough has been presented to establish the general proposition that, at the expiration of a half-century of discussion, experiment, and contest, the degree of Bachelor of Science has become respectable, and that, at least, the college world is beginning to respect it as a title which bears witness of liberal culture. It is only just to remark, before passing from this phase of the discussion, that the science men and the modern-language men have at every stage of the evolution of the B.S. degree manifested an earnest desire to make the course leading to it equivalent to any other bachelor course in respect to the quantity and also the quality of the requirements both *before* and *after* admission to college. Wherever they have been allowed they have fully demonstrated that under favorable conditions, *i. e.*, when all courses were granted equal favor by college authorities, the B.S. course had steadily increased its requirements, and has established its claims to respectability, and has, particularly in later years, gained marked popular favor among students.

The struggles of the degrees of Bachelor of Philosophy and Bachelor of Literature have been similar to those of the degree of Bachelor of Science, but have not been crowned with so much success. Created to meet the wants of students not able or not willing to comply altogether with the classical requirements for the B.A. degree, established in many instances that persons of inferior preparatory training of any kind might be admitted to college and given the opportunity of securing diplomas of graduation, it is no wonder that these two degrees have been regarded as unworthy of ranking with that degree which has all along been the standard for measuring liberal culture. They have often been considered, and properly so by both students and faculties, as species of "consolation prizes," doled out to those unable to secure more excellent and honorable awards. Notwithstanding the fact just now recounted, there has been for some years a well-defined and a partially successful effort to strengthen and enrich the courses leading to these degrees. Among educational leaders there have been constantly deepening convictions that requirements for all Bachelor degrees should be equalized; that the granting of "cheap degrees" lowers the standard of culture and becomes a prolific source of other educational evils. As these convictions have here and there been transformed from idea into reality, these two minor degrees have gained cast, and, like the B.S. degree, they are now in some places accorded decent recognition as badges of culture. The fact is that, the inequalities in the requirements for the several Bachelor degrees once being removed, the differences remaining dwindle into insignificance. One is consequently not surprised that President Eliot, after calling attention in his annual report, dated January 9, 1899, to the fact that the aggregate of the new degrees conferred in 1898 by eight of the leading colleges exceeded the number of B.A. degrees awarded by the same universities, and after showing how great have been the inroads made upon the fields of liberal culture, territory which was formerly occupied exclusively by the old degree, submits this reflection: "It is, therefore, a pressing question how to secure and defend a legitimate province for the degree of Bachelor of Arts." This same question was raised at Cornell as soon as the requirements for the several degrees were equalized, and during the session of 1895-6 it was decided that, because liberal scholarship is the one common aim of all students prosecuting study in the liberal arts and pure sciences, only one degree be granted to signify that this one aim of the undergraduate has been realized. It was argued that the

purely academic department of Cornell is the expression of a single educational principle, with which the multiplication of degrees is clearly inconsistent. The conclusion was reached, which answered President Eliot's "pressing question" four years before he propounded it, that the legitimate province of the B.A. degree is the entire range of studies that have demonstrated their fitness to bear the title of liberal arts, all studies that are not to be classified as belonging to technical or professional education.

From the foregoing discussion of the new degrees one may not without reason conclude that history will in all probability repeat itself, and that the B.A. degree will again hold undisputed sway in the realm of the liberal arts, but a realm amazingly and gloriously enriched by the policy of expansion which has characterized the world of learning during the latter half of the nineteenth century.

As confirmatory, in some degree at least, of the general doctrines advocated in this paper, some testimony very recently gathered together from different sections of this country will now be submitted without comment or argument. In September last a large number of presidents and a few professors of the science and art of education, engaged in college and university work, were requested to answer these five questions :

1. Should only one Bachelor's degree be conferred by American universities upon graduates completing courses of instruction leading to general culture ?

2. If but one degree should be conferred, should it be the B.A. ?

3. Is the degree of B.S. generally considered inferior to the degree of B.A. ?

4. Should the degree of B.A. ever be conferred upon one that has not studied Latin and Greek, or that has not studied either Latin or Greek ?

5. Should local conditions have weight in the determination of the question whether there shall be a unification or multiplication of degrees ?

Following are to be found the replies that have been received :

PRESIDENT C. K. ADAMS, University of Wisconsin

I have not thought it wise to urge that a single Bachelor's degree be conferred by this University. If we could elevate the courses leading to the degree of Bachelor of Letters and Bachelor of Science so as to be quite sure that the preparatory work was equal to the other, I should not object to giving the degree of A.B. to such students. But the objections on the part of our

classical teachers are so strenuous that I have thought the disadvantages would be greater than the advantages. We therefore continue to give four degrees: Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Letters, Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Philosophy.

2. If one degree were to be conferred, I think it should be the degree of Bachelor of Arts.

3. Whether the B.A. degree should be conferred upon those who have not studied Latin and Greek, is one of those vexed questions which are always settled by the predilections of the persons having the matter in hand. In this University we do not believe that the degree should be given to any person who has not studied both of the ancient classics. This is founded upon the traditional significance of the degree. The time is evidently coming when this traditional significance will no longer be of importance, but at present we adhere to the former method of limiting the degree to those who have taken the ancient classical course.

4. The degree of B.S. is by very many, perhaps by all except scientific men, considered inferior to the degree of B.A. Many scientific men also consider it as inferior. A few consider it equal. I think the best educated of our men think that the B.A. student, who after the second year of his college course devotes himself to science, will before many years outrun the student who began the B.S. course in the high school.

5. I think every university, when once it has been established and has passed the days of precarious existence, should determine the question for itself. So much depends upon feeling and atmosphere in a university that it is sometimes better to do a slightly inferior thing and have everybody heartily satisfied, than to do a slightly superior thing and have a large number of malcontents.

PRESIDENT JAMES B. ANGELL, University of Michigan

1. There is considerable difference of opinion in the North among men equally qualified to judge whether there should, or should not, be more than one Bachelor's degree. Personally I have deemed it wisest to have more than one. I have felt that the degree of A.B. has a historic significance of which no one college has a right to rob it, and, therefore, that it is better to retain that for those who have both Latin and Greek; but many men whose opinion I respect differ from me.

2. If but one degree be conferred, it should doubtless be the A.B. degree.

3. Many doubtless do regard the B.S. as inferior in value to that of A.B., but I think that opinion is somewhat changing upon this subject since the colleges are making larger requirements for the degrees of B.S. than formerly.

4. Local conditions must doubtless have weight in the determination of the question you submit. I am bound to confess that I think there is a tendency towards adopting the degree of A.B. for all full collegiate courses, though personally I am not ready for the change.

ACTING CHANCELLOR CHARLES E. BESSEY, University of Nebraska

1. It has been our practice in this University for a number of years to give but two degrees for the ordinary four-year courses. All graduates of the College of Literature, Science, and Arts receive the degree of Bachelor of Arts, while the graduates of the Industrial College (College of Science) receive the single degree of Bachelor of Science. By referring to the University Calendar for 1898-9 you will find that the first-named college includes twenty groups of study (courses of study), but with all the differences thus provided for, every graduate of this college receives the degree Bachelor of Arts. You will notice also that the Industrial College includes fourteen groups of study; and here, while there is much variation again, every graduate receives the degree Bachelor of Science.

We have thus reduced our degrees to one in each of our colleges giving four years of training above an equal entrance requirement. Of course the College of Law has its own degree, and, when the College of Medicine is finally put on its feet, its degree will be different again. That these two degrees are regarded as of equal culture value by the faculty of the Graduate School, is indicated by the fact that Bachelors of Science are equally eligible with Bachelors of Art to the second degree, namely, Master of Arts. We do not confer the degree "Master of Science."

2. In any college having classical and literary groups of study, it is our opinion that the degree should be Bachelor of Arts, while in a college of science the degree should be Bachelor of Science.

3. In this University it has uniformly been our practice to require Latin of all who present themselves for the degree of Bachelor of Arts. Greek is required in certain groups only. Where Greek is not required, an equivalent amount of science and modern language must be offered.

4. The degree of Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.) is made equal to the degree of Bachelor of Arts. That is, the entrance requirements are as high and the work in the University as severe for the science degree as for the degree in arts. Yet I think it is still felt by many students, and some of the faculty, that the arts degree is higher than the degree in science. Many young men feel that the arts degree implies more with the public than the science degree. Locally, I think it is generally conceded that it requires less hard work to secure our arts degree in certain groups than the degree in science.

5. I do not think it advisable to take local conditions into consideration in determining the question whether there shall be several or few or one degree given in any college. It is impossible at the present time to make the title of the degree (B.A. or B.Sc.) indicate precisely the shade of training of the bearer. If degrees are to have value they must indicate *amount* of training, *amount* of culture, or we are driven to the absurd alternative of having a degree for not only each group of studies laid down in our calendars, but

also for every student who by the use of electives has changed his studies. The latter alternative would be too absurd for consideration.

I think we are driven to the conclusion that we must attempt to indicate simply *amount of training*. We may, as in this University, indicate general trend of training also, as we do by the two degrees which we confer. However, in our case you will notice that these two degrees to which I have referred are in separate colleges, each controlled by its own faculty, and these degrees are conferred, the one by the one faculty, and the other by the other.

I trust what I have said may enable you to understand what we are attempting to do here. I might add that not only are the science men eligible to the second degree in arts, but also they are eligible to our degree of Doctor of Philosophy, a degree, by the way, which we are very chary in bestowing. We require for it long and severe study, *always in residence*.

PRESIDENT THOS. D. BOYD, Louisiana State University

1. No. We have had the two degrees of B.A. and B.S. so long that I think it would lead to confusion to adopt one degree at this time. I believe that it is pretty well understood that the B.A. degree stands for a general culture course in which emphasis has been put upon literary subjects; and the B.S. degree for one in which great stress has been laid upon scientific subjects.

2. If only one degree is to be conferred, it should be the B.A. degree.

3. B.A. should not be conferred upon a student who has not studied Latin.

4. Viewed from the standpoint of general culture, I think the B.S. degree is considered inferior to the B.A. degree. I think, however, that a change is taking place in this.

5. In my judgment, local conditions should have no weight whatever in determining whether there should be a unification or a multiplication of degrees.

PROFESSOR ELMER E. BROWN, University of California

Replying to your communication, I would say that my view of the question of college degrees should be taken as representing only my individual taste or preference in the matter. I have not yet seen an argument on either side of the question which seems to me at all conclusive.

Personally, I think that the practice of giving more than one degree, as it has grown up in this country, should be allowed to go on. I think more harm than good will come from the attempt to brush it aside, and offer the B.A. degree for all courses.

You ask whether the degree of B.S. is generally considered inferior to the degree of B.A. I suppose you refer to common opinion outside of universities, and if so, I would answer *yes*. It is partly for this reason, no doubt, that if only one degree is offered, it is pretty certain to be that of A.B.

I prefer decidedly to have the B.A. degree stand for a humanistic course, including both Latin and Greek, together with other studies—history, philosophy, mathematics, natural science, etc.

It seems to me that local conditions should not be decisive in such a question as this. University education ought, of all things, to tend away from provincialism.

I am well aware that these opinions are at variance with a strong tendency in certain portions of our educational world. This tendency toward a unification of degrees may sweep all before it. If so, I shall doubtless be able, in common with many others, to fall in with the new order of things; for the question does not seem to me a fundamental one. But my personal taste and preference is on the side of the system which now obtains in the University of California.

PRESIDENT JOHN L. BUCHANAN, University of Arkansas

1. I think not. Different courses of instruction lead to general culture. It is too much to say that there is only one course of study, that only certain subjects can constitute a course of study leading to general culture, and therefore to the Bachelor's degree. I do not maintain that Latin and Greek should be required in a B.A. course. But that degree ought not to be conferred without including one of them in the course leading to it. English, modern languages, the moral sciences, including philosophy, psychology, logic, ethics, economics, sociology, etc., and also some of the observational sciences, lead to general culture. Yet—it may be the influence of tradition—I would prefer B.Ph. or B.S. for such courses.

2. It should be B.A.

3. Answered in the first.

4. B.S. is not unfrequently considered inferior to B.A. There is a tendency to so regard it here. We are endeavoring to make them equal in the work required and the estimate made of them. I understand B.S. is not considered inferior to B.A. in the University of Virginia.

5. To a very limited extent, if any. The multiplication of degrees I think should be avoided as far as practicable. Not more than two or three undergraduate degrees ought to be conferred. As you, I doubt not, are aware, Cornell University, University of Indiana, and Leland Stanford are giving, or proposing to give, B.A. without Latin or Greek. The progress of educational thought *may* lead to similar action on the part of other institutions. But I am persuaded the time has not yet come for such action, if it ever does, or should, come.

PRESIDENT W. H. BUCKHAM, University of Vermont

We are here not reconciled to the plan of giving A.B. indiscriminately to all completing four-year courses. We think its historical character should

be maintained as a guarantee of humanistic culture. But the trend is the other way, and in time we shall doubtless have to give in.

PROFESSOR NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER, Columbia University

1. In my judgment only one Bachelor's degree should be conferred by American colleges upon graduates who complete a course of instruction of a general-culture character.

2. In my judgment the degree conferred should be the degree of B.A.

3. I do not believe in insisting upon a knowledge of both ancient classical languages for general culture; but do believe that a study of Latin must be included in such a course if the basis for general culture is to be laid in the history of civilization.

4. The degree of B.S. is generally considered inferior to the degree of B.A., and the degree of Ph.B. is thought nothing of at all.

5. I do not know any local conditions that could overcome the question of principle involved in arranging these degrees.

Permit me, in addition, simply to add a paragraph.

My conception of the B.A. degree is that it has stood and should now stand for general culture. The content of that degree has changed from time to time and will always change as the conception of culture changes. To attempt to fasten upon the degree any one content is to be false to history and to the fundamental facts in educational evolution.

PRESIDENT W. A. CANDLER, Emory College

1. No.

2. Yes.

3. No.

4. Yes.

5. No.

CHANCELLOR JAMES R. DAY, Syracuse University

(Answers prepared by Professor Smalley, professor of Latin in Syracuse University, with whose answers Chancellor Day is in accord.)

1. The courses should be differentiated and lead to appropriate degrees: just as we confer M.D. for the professional course in medicine, not LL.B., etc., because the difference between arts and science is quite as great. A.B. means something definite now. If given for all courses it would soon mean nothing. If the tendency to looseness becomes great, we may have to name the college after the degree.

2. Probably better A.B., as the older distinctive college degree.

3. Both Greek and Latin should be required because the degree's history means culture that involves familiarity with ancient life, especially the life of those nations which have made our civilization what it is, but can only come from a study of the languages, as every language teacher knows.

4. It is different, stands for less culture attainment and more knowledge of science. From the culture or humanistic standpoint it is inferior, *i. e.*, B.S. is inferior to A.B. From the standpoint of science, it is superior. Probably on the whole it is generally regarded as inferior.

5. I do not think so. The question is too broad-reaching and involves principles of so great an extent that local conditions can hardly change it. Vice can never be virtue whatever its environments.

There is less reason for the degree of Ph.B. than of A.B. and B.S., but even that has a place and meaning.

PRESIDENT CHARLES W. ELIOT, Harvard University

1. Yes, provided the courses be about equally long and serious.
2. Yes.
3. Yes. Harvard College says—No.
4. Yes.
5. Yes. But it might be wise to do neither.

PRESIDENT G. A. GATES, Iowa University

1. Indifferent. We give two : Ph.B. and A.B.
2. (Not answered.)
3. The A.B. degree should never be conferred upon one that has not studied both Latin and Greek.
4. I think so. Yes. I'm sure of it. It ought to be.
5. Probably. But it is easy to err in this regard.

The above, in this form, seems dogmatic ; it is only meant to be brief and to answer the questions from only one man's point of view.

PRESIDENT FRANK P. GRAVES, University of Washington

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Yes, but not as much so as formerly.
5. Yes.

PRESIDENT ARTHUR T. HADLEY, Yale University

1. Our own plan, which has proved on the whole satisfactory, is to give two Bachelor's degrees for general culture : the B.A., implying a knowledge of Latin and Greek ; and the Ph.B., for courses without Greek or any considerable amount of Latin.

2. As the B.A. traditionally implies the possession of classical knowledge, it seems to me that it should not be conferred for purely scientific courses, at least, without much conference on the part of the different universities.

The answer to your other questions, as far as I can give it, seems to include itself in these two. I regret very much not to be able to say anything

more definite, but have simply given the ideas as they present themselves here.

PROFESSOR PAUL H. HANUS, Harvard University

1. Yes: The Bachelor's degree should stand for the successful completion of a substantial college course in studies pursued for general culture.

2. If any of the existing degrees were retained I should say it ought to be the B.A. degree. But it seems to me there are good reasons for discarding all the contemporary Bachelor's degrees and substituting for them B.A.S. (Bachelor of Academic Studies).

3. The B.A. degree has been conferred at this University, for years, on men who have studied neither Latin nor Greek *in college*, but all such men must have had the preparatory Latin, at least. They need not have had the preparatory Greek. I think it is generally admitted that no harm has been done either to scholarship or to the University by this practice. On the contrary, it is safe to say that the Harvard B.A. never stood for as much solid work as it does today, and never was more valued than it is today.

4. The B.S. degree is usually considered inferior to the B.A. degree, and often it is really inferior. The inferiority is due to the fact that the requirements for admission to courses leading to the B.S. degree are nearly always inferior to the requirements for admission to B.A. courses, the difference being about as much as is represented by a year's study, and also to the fact that the instruction both in quantity and quality in scientific courses has been, until recently, and too often still is, inferior to the instruction given in the classical and semi-classical courses.

5. Undoubtedly they should, temporarily. But "local conditions" can be changed gradually.

P. S.—I need hardly add to 3 that I think the Bachelor's degree (B.A. if we retain that degree, and I see no disposition to do away with it) should be given at the end of any good college course whether a man has *ever* studied Latin or Greek, or not.

PRESIDENT GEORGE HARRIS, Amherst College

Your questions are important and to be answered properly require more explanations than I can give in a letter.

In general, I think that other courses are, or may be made, of equal value with the classical, and that the degrees given should signify that.

PROVOST CHARLES C. HARRISON, University of Pennsylvania

It is my opinion that no other degree than B.A. should be conferred upon those graduating from general culture courses, but that until some radical change is made in regard to the position of classical studies, Latin and Greek should be essential to such a degree. From a general culture point, B.S. is necessarily inferior to A.B., and will be until scientific studies are so pursued and so connected with liberal studies, as to guarantee an equivalent literary

and æsthetic training. That their equivalency in "mental culture" is, or may be, a fact, I do not dispute, nor that from a scientific standpoint, A.B. is inferior to B.S. The relative superiority depends upon the standpoint, or the purpose in view. Such a degree as B.S. is essential in these days. Only let the courses leading to it be so complete and so thorough as to ensure the respect of educated men in general. The multiplication of degrees is to be avoided as much as possible. It should only occur in institutions which can really and fully furnish courses so radically distinct as to absolutely require specific marking in their graduates.

PRESIDENT GEO. A. HUNTER, Delaware College

1. It seems to me to be well to keep the two Bachelor's degrees, B.A. and B.S., but further multiplication should be avoided. Instead of B.C.E., etc., the degree should be B. S., it seems to me, with the added phrase *in Civil Engineering*, or other subject, if it should be desirable to indicate the direction of the graduate's training.

2. If only one degree is conferred it should be the B. A. degree, as the oldest, historically.

3. I think the B.A. degree should be conferred upon such only as have studied either both Latin and Greek or Latin.

4. It should not be so considered.

5. No.

PROFESSOR B. A. HINSDALE, University of Michigan

I am in receipt of your letter of the 11th inst., and hasten to express my views upon the various questions propounded. If we could go back fifty years or so to the time when the Bachelor's degree began in this country, I am disposed to think that it would be best to have one Bachelor's degree offered by the schools of general education. If this were to be done, of course the degree selected should be the B.A. degree, for reasons that are, I take it, too obvious to need formal statement. Whether it is now possible to go back as stated above, is in my view a very doubtful question. To be more definite, I do not believe it can be done, taking the colleges and universities of the country together. We have, I think, moved too far in the line of differentiation to enable us now to turn back the hand upon the dial plate. It is not at all improbable, but the contrary, that particular institutions here and there that have been giving more than one degree, may be able to retrace their steps, and it may be advantageous for them to do so. The opinion that I wish to express is that a general movement with that end in view would, in my opinion, not be crowned with success. As to whether the degree of B.S. is generally considered inferior to the degree of B.A., I should be disposed to answer in the affirmative. There are probably men here and there, as men who have taken the degree, or are especially interested in it, who would not be willing to exchange it for the older degree, but, in my view, taking the

country together, the B.S. degree has not yet been put upon a level with the B.A. degree in the popular estimation.

To your question whether local conditions should have weight in the determination of the question of unification or multiplication of degrees, I will say that I see no reason why it may not be very proper to accord such weight to them. This assumes, of course, that there will continue to be more than one degree, which is the opinion I have expressed above. At the same time, I wish to say very emphatically that I am not in favor of the undue multiplication of degrees. I think some institutions have gone to an absurd extent in that direction. If I belonged to an institution that was now giving but one degree, and that the B.A. degree, I should, as a matter of general policy, oppose differentiation. On the other hand, if I belonged to an institution that gave two or more degrees where it was possible, without serious friction, to return to the one degree, I should, as a matter of policy, probably favor that course.

Here at Michigan we give four Bachelor's degrees, and I do not see that it is possible for us to reduce the number; certainly I should be opposed to increasing it. Taking our conditions all into the account, I think it would be better for us to have only three degrees, the B.A., the B.S., and the Ph.B. degrees. At the same time I have no idea that a proposition to cut off the B.L. could be carried through our faculty. We discussed the subject here quite fully a few years ago, and I think generally came to the conclusion that we could do nothing. I may add that the question is seriously embarrassed by the Greek issue. We give the B.A. degree only to students who have taken Greek. If this impediment were out of the way, it might be possible for us to simplify matters. Some of our men, I will add, who are strong believers in unity, greatly favor what they call a "University Degree," that is, one degree for any and all purposes. No doubt much can be said in favor of such a proposition from a theoretical point of view, but, as I have said before, it seems to me at present impracticable. We have, I think, made too much educational history that will have to be unmade, in a sense, to enable us to bring that about.

PRESIDENT WM. DEW. HYDE, Bowdoin College

1. Yes. Though I am sorry to say we have three.
2. Yes; B.A.
3. Yes, without Greek; but not without either Greek or Latin.
4. Yes.
5. No.

PRESIDENT R. H. JESSE, University of Missouri

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. I think not.
5. I see no reason why they should.

(President Jesse adds that the University of Missouri will sooner or later adopt his notions about degrees.)

PRESIDENT DAVID S. JORDAN, Leland Stanford Jr. University

1. It is best that a single degree should be conferred upon graduates in courses of general culture.

2. The B.A. should be the only recognized degree for such graduates.

3. So long as the courses are of equal value and requirements, it is a matter of trifling consequence whether Latin or Greek, or some other language has been made the vehicle of culture.

4. In the transition state of the university, the degree of B.S. was distinctly inferior to that of the B.A. Now that this is no longer the case in the various institutions, there are no reasons for continuing the separate degree.

5. Local conditions should have weight in deciding whether it is wise for the college to adopt any recognized form. Some institutions are in a position which makes leadership easy and safe. Others are dependent upon environment, and all institutions must recognize that many reforms, impossible at present, are necessary in the future. One of these, I feel perfectly sure, is the ultimate abolition of the whole system of degrees, but this is not the time for any one institution to undertake the task.

I have not kept track of the publications on this subject. Dr. Schurman, of Cornell, has a strong defense of Cornell in adopting the single degree. Institutions which have made the change lose interest in any other point of view.

CHANCELLOR J. H. KIRKLAND, Vanderbilt University

In reply to your circular letter of September 11, I beg to say that in my opinion local conditions have some weight in determining the question of college degrees. There is some advantage in the unification of degrees. The argument for this, theoretically, is a good one. I am inclined, however, to look with disfavor on the extension of this idea in the South. Pupils who enter college in the South have generally had very little training outside the work in Latin and Greek. I feel, therefore, that if we admit students to the freshman class as candidates for B.A. without Latin and without Greek, we shall fill our freshman classes with a large amount of improper material. With well-equipped schools able to give instruction in history and in science, and with strong requirements for admission, and ample substitutes for Latin and Greek, I think the danger would not be so great. Taking our country as a whole, I am inclined not to regard with favor the idea of unifying our college degrees at present.

PRESIDENT GEORGE E. MACLEAN, University of Iowa

There is no time to reply but briefly to your inquiries of September 11.

1. I am in favor of having a degree approximate a certificate of attainment; therefore more than one Bachelor's degree should be given.

2. The B.A. degree should be kept to its historic American sense, and require at least a minimum of discipline in the humanities, including Latin, and, if possible, Greek.

3. No.

4. I doubt if the B.S. is generally considered inferior, although it is among the old-fashioned college men.

5. The standard should be that of the republic of letters rather than the provincial one of the locality.

PRESIDENT W. MERRIFIELD, University of North Dakota

1. I believe so.

2. Yes.

3. Yes. We confer it on such.

4. I believe so.

5. No.

PRESIDENT CYRUS NORTHROP, University of Minnesota

In answer to your letter of September 11, I will say that I am not as particular about degrees as some are, but I like to have a degree indicating somewhat clearly what it represents. I like to have B.A. stand for the classical course. B.S. I regard as an excellent degree. It represents a very strong course with us, not inferior to the classical if all the Latin is taken as it usually is by our scientific students.

I would not confer the B.A. degree on a person who had not had Greek and Latin. I am willing to have local conditions govern, subject to the general principle of guarding properly B.A. and B.S.

PRESIDENT JAMES K. POWERS, University of Alabama

I think that universities should confer two Bachelor's degrees. This seems to me in consonance with the scope of such institutions. These should be the B.A. and the B.S., in my opinion. While two Bachelor's degrees represent the same amount of culture, similar in nature, it seems that the lines between these are sufficiently clearly drawn to justify different degrees.

2. If but one degree is conferred, by all means that should be, I think, the B.A.

3. I do not think I would like to make so strong a statement as the first part of the question. Yet such is the rule in this institution, and for the present at least I cordially concur in its wisdom. I would be strongly opposed to any change that would confer this degree without Latin *or* Greek. If one of these subjects were excluded from the requirements, I should insist on more extensive work in the other. I cannot see how anyone without one or the other of these languages could have culture enough and of proper character to justify the conferring of this degree. To confer it without either would be going too far away from landmarks. I would greatly prefer to see the degree abolished.

4. In culture, as in power, the degree of B.S. is considerably lower here than the B.A. I think it is so generally, at least among institutions in the South, with which I am most familiar. With us it has been a study to determine how we could best equalize the requirements, or even approach equality. One step in this direction is in *requiring* more mathematics for the B.S. than for the B.A.

5. I think the extent to which local conditions should control in the matter of degrees should be circumscribed. In the main, there should be coöperation and uniformity in the entire matter, leaving only the details to be subject to local modifications.

PRESIDENT JEROME H. RAYMOND, West Virginia University

1. I believe that only one degree ought to be given by American Universities to graduates who complete courses of instruction that lead to general culture. My reason for this belief is that it is impossible adequately to define by any degree the character of the work that has been done by the student for the degree, and I believe where it is impossible to do this accurately, it is foolish and misleading to attempt to do it partially. Moreover, the conferring of different Bachelor's degrees makes some students arrogant and is humiliating to others, because wherever there is a diversity of degrees, one or two will be considered more dignified than the others. I have observed this state of affairs in all six of the universities with which I have been connected where different Bachelor's degrees have been granted, and the gratifying absence of it in one university that I have been connected with which gave only one Bachelor's degree for all courses.

2. I believe emphatically that the only degree which ought to be given is the B.A. degree. This is the degree that is given now by all the institutions that give only one Bachelor's degree — Harvard, Cornell, Indiana, Leland Stanford, Johns Hopkins, West Virginia, and others. The fact that these universities confer this degree upon all graduates who complete general culture courses is perhaps the strongest argument in its favor. Another argument is, however, that the B.A. is the degree most students want. It is the old established degree, and the degree that has the most commercial value. I see no reason why it should not be made the universal Bachelor's degree.

3. I cannot understand why the B.A. degree should not be conferred upon students who have not studied both Latin and Greek, or either of these languages. A number of the best institutions in our country now give the degree of B.A. to students who have not studied these languages, provided they have done enough work in other lines. Among these institutions may be named Leland Stanford, Cornell, Indiana, Harvard, and West Virginia universities. There is nothing in the degree of B.A. that indicates Latin and Greek. It is true that a good many colleges reserve this degree at present for those who have a smattering of one or both of these languages, but this is simply a survival into modern times of the mediæval custom, and we must

remember that in the Middle Ages the natural sciences, history, economics, sociology, and the modern languages were not thought of as a part of a liberal education. Today we do regard these and other comparatively new subjects as equally important as Latin and Greek. Why, then, should we not recognize their importance by permitting students to study them if they desire, even to the exclusion of Latin and Greek if need be? And if we permit them to study them, why should we not recognize good work in these subjects by conferring upon students who have completed this line of work and omitted Latin and Greek, the most dignified and valuable of the Bachelor's degrees? It is folly for us any longer to pretend that Latin and Greek are in themselves superior to other more modern subjects of study, and yet by conferring the most honorable degree exclusively upon those who have studied a little Latin and Greek, we perpetuate the old pretense of the superiority of the dead languages.

4. The degree of B.S., I think, is generally considered inferior to the degree of A.B. I have been connected, as a student and a teacher, with seven universities, and in every one of them the general feeling was that the B.S. degree is distinctly inferior to the B.A. degree. I well remember the feeling of calm superiority which possessed me and other B.A. students when I was an undergraduate. We regarded ourselves as of quite superior clay, and there was almost a standing feud between us and the B.S. students, and I am still inclined to think there was a basis for the feeling, for, in order to secure the degree of B.A., decidedly more work was required. This is still the case in many institutions. Indeed, in one college I know of, the degree of B.S. is given a year before the degree of B.A., and so, if a student wants B.A., he has to work a year longer than for the B.S.

5. I do not see why local conditions should have weight in the determination of the question whether there should be a unification or a multiplication of degrees. Of course, local conditions will have an influence in determining this question, because in most college communities there are many men whose opinions are fixed, and who are influenced more by feeling and prejudice than they are by reason. "It is hard to teach old dogs new tricks," and I suppose that the educational world will have to wait for some of the older men to drop out of the university world before the change can come. Fortunately, however, the change has come and is coming rapidly. I do not wish to be considered an enemy of Latin and Greek. I believe they are valuable studies, but it seems to me folly to compel any student to take these studies in order to secure the coveted degree of B.A. I am glad to say that we do not do it here now, though we have done so up to this summer. Our last catalogue is constructed upon the old lines. We are now out of the woods, however, and hereafter will give the degree of B.A. to any student who has satisfied all entrance requirements, and has completed forty-two full college courses, of which nine courses and a thesis are in some one department of study, selected by the student as his major subject or specialty. The

professor in charge of the student's major study acts as the student's advisor and may require the student to complete nine courses in his major subject, and certain other courses (not to exceed six) which the major professor may consider desirable collateral work. These latter courses make up the student's minor work. Aside from these major and minor studies, a student may freely choose any work offered in the university for which his previous studies have prepared him. This system we feel is infinitely superior to the old system. Perhaps I should say that a course means the amount of work done by a class meeting five times a quarter (twelve weeks.)

It occurs to me that you may possibly be interested in our conditions of admission. They are somewhat different from the conditions of admission which prevail in most universities, inasmuch as no subject is absolutely required, though you will see that the amount of work that is required is greater than that which is required in many colleges and universities. I inclose a printed statement of our conditions of admission. They are more nearly like the conditions of admission to Leland Stanford Jr. University than any other. I am personally very strongly in favor of the system we have here, and the same may be said of almost every member of the faculty.

PROFESSOR R. N. ROARK, State College of Kentucky

Your letter to President Patterson was handed me for answer. Replying I shall give the opinions of both Professor Neville, our Dean of the Classical Course, and myself.

Professor Neville is in favor of only one degree, and thinks that should be the B.A. He also thinks that the B.A. is esteemed, generally, above the B.S. He thinks the B.A. should not be conferred unless the candidate has had Latin, and that he also should have either Greek or the two leading modern languages.

He thinks local conditions should not weigh in the matter of degrees. Personally I think the two degrees should stand of equal value, but in order to make them so the B.S. courses, as now planned, are not sufficient; they should have more culture work in them. On the third, fourth, and fifth points I agree with Professor Neville.

PRESIDENT J. G. SCHURMAN, Cornell University

1. Only one Bachelor's degree is to be conferred by Cornell hereafter upon graduates completing general culture courses.

2. That degree is to be B.A.

3. It may occasionally be conferred upon one who has not studied either Latin or Greek.

4. The B.S. degree has been throughout the country commonly given upon the completion of courses of less advanced character than those required for the B.A. degree, and consequently has a somewhat lower reputation. At Cornell, however, before its consolidation with the B.A., it had

been raised to equal difficulty and dignity with the B.A., and was not here considered an inferior degree.

5. I am not certain exactly what is meant by "local conditions;" but if you mean such local conditions as a difference in difficulty of entrance requirements for the various degrees, it would have a weight in the determination as to unification or multiplication of degrees.

PRESIDENT S. H. SNOW, University of Kansas

1. I think so.
2. B.A.
3. I should say that Latin should be required and not both Latin and Greek.
4. I think so.
5. (Not answered).

PRESIDENT JOSEPH SWAIN, Indiana University

1. I believe that the only one Bachelor's degree should be conferred by American universities on graduates completing courses of instruction that lead to general culture. Indiana University has given but one degree for several years. It has had a good influence in unifying the work and making all courses of equal value.

2. B.A. seems to be the natural degree.
3. I should not be in favor of conferring the B.A. degree on students who have not taken the minimum course in foreign languages. In Indiana University we allow students to take for this required language Latin, Greek, French, and German.
4. I think the degree of B.S. is generally considered inferior to the B.A. degree.
5. Local conditions should be considered, and those conditions shaped, it seems to me, toward the end of one degree, which shall ultimately be given.

PRESIDENT CHARLES F. THWING, Western Reserve University

1. The reasons for and against the giving of one Bachelor's degree for students of all courses seem to me to be pretty evenly balanced. The principles lying at the base of each side are these: In favor of one degree: the Bachelor degree represents power and culture, however secured. Against the giving of one degree: the content of studies is of equal value; the culture and power secured by scientific studies are somewhat unlike those secured by literary studies; as civilization advances differentiation occurs. Therefore degrees should indicate the kind of training that lies behind.

2. By all means.
3. The answer to this question depends, it seems to me, upon the answer made to the first question.
4. It is.
5. Yes, but it is a question of degree.

PRESIDENT W. L. WILSON, Washington and Lee University

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Latin or Greek.
4. Generally so considered for general culture, but not as much as in years past. Much depends on the college and its required courses.
5. Such conditions are to be considered ; but multiplication of degrees should be avoided as far as possible.

PRESIDENT F. C. WOODWARD, South Carolina College

1. I think not.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. I think there should be uniformity.

[The limitations of space make it possible to print here only a small portion of the discussions of the meeting. These discussions will appear in full in the *Proceedings of the Association*, edited by the secretary, J. H. Kirkland.—EDITOR SCHOOL REVIEW.]